

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR 52810

Date: 14/7/2025

Title: "ZYGOMATIC IMPLANTS: ADVANCES AND CLINICAL COMPARISONS BETWEEN BRAZIL AND THE UNITED STATES"

Recommendation:

Accept as it is

Accept after minor revision – YES

Accept after major revision

Do not accept (*Reasons below*)

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality		✓		
Techn. Quality	✓			
Clarity	✓			
Significance	✓			

Reviewer Name: Dr. Vasudha Kommu

Date: 14/7/2025

Reviewer's Comment for Publication.

(To be published with the manuscript in the journal)

The reviewer is requested to provide a brief comment (3-4 lines) highlighting the significance, strengths, or key insights of the manuscript. This comment will be Displayed in the journal publication alongside with the reviewers name.

This manuscript titled **"ZYGOMATIC IMPLANTS: ADVANCES AND CLINICAL COMPARISONS BETWEEN BRAZIL AND THE UNITED STATES"** offers a comprehensive comparative analysis of zygomatic implants between Brazil and the United States, highlighting their distinct approaches to development, clinical application, and technological advancements. The review effectively contrasts the standardized protocols and regulatory emphasis in the U.S. with Brazil's more flexible and adaptive methodology, underscoring the benefits of international collaboration in advancing implant dentistry. It provides valuable insights into complication rates, prevention, and ethical considerations, making it a relevant resource for practitioners seeking to enhance outcomes and knowledge transfer in this specialized field.

As a narrative review, this study inherently lacks a systematic methodology, which can introduce bias and limit the exhaustiveness of the literature analyzed. It does not present new data, relying instead on existing literature, and therefore cannot draw definitive statistical conclusions or establish direct causality.

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Recommendation: Accept with minor revisions

Detailed Reviewer's Report

1. **Study Design (Narrative Review):** This manuscript is a narrative review. While it provides a broad overview and comparison, narrative reviews are inherently subjective and do not follow systematic protocols for literature search and selection. This can lead to selection bias and may not cover all relevant studies, potentially missing critical information or perspectives.
2. **Lack of Systematic Methodology:** Unlike systematic reviews or meta-analyses, a narrative review does not involve predefined search strategies, inclusion/exclusion criteria, or a rigorous assessment of study quality. This means the comprehensive nature of the review is dependent on the authors' existing knowledge and chosen sources, which might not be exhaustive.
3. **Potential for Author Bias:** Without a systematic approach to literature selection and appraisal, the interpretations and emphasis on certain findings might reflect the authors' pre-existing perspectives or biases.
4. **Generalizability of Findings:** While the review compares approaches in two different regions (Brazil and the U.S.), the conclusions drawn are generalizations based on varying clinical practices and regulatory environments. The inherent differences between these regions make direct comparisons complex, and a "perfect" alignment of practices is unlikely.
5. **Implications of Regulatory Differences:** The review highlights differences in regulatory oversight (e.g., FDA in the U.S. vs. Brazil's more flexible approach). While this is discussed, a deeper analysis of how these regulatory differences specifically impact patient outcomes, safety, or innovation beyond general observations could enhance the review.